DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 298 786 FL 017 589

AUTHOR	Friedman, Grace Ibanez; And Others
TITLE	State Incentive Grants, 1986-1987: Language Development Support Systems, Intensive Second Language Development for CAR Schools, Curriculum Specialists Project. OEA Evaluation Report.
INSTITUTION	New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn. Office of Educational Assessment.
SPONS AGENCY	New York State Education Dept., Albany. Bureau of Bilingual Education.
PUB DATE	[88]
NOTE	39p.; Prepared by the O.E. A. Bilingual Education Evaluation Unit.
AVAILABLE FROM	New York City Board of Education, Office of Educational Assessment, 110 Livingston Street, Brooklyn, NY 11201.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Bilingual Education Programs; Bilingual Teachers; Chinese; *Computer Literacy; Creoles; *Curriculum Development; Elementary Education; English (Second Language); French; Grade 3; Grade 8; Incentive Grants; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Instructional Improvement; Language of Instruction; Material Development; *Native Language Instruction; Program Evaluation; Second Language Instruction; Spanish; State Aid; Teacher Workshops
IDENTIFIERS	*New York (New York)

ABSTRACT

In 1986-87, the New York State Education Department's Bureau of Bilingual Education provided incentive grants to three New York City Board of Education's Office of Bilingual Education projects whose common goal was to improve instructional quality in schools that the state Comprehensive Assessment Report (CAR) had identified as having low student performance levels. The Language Development Support Systems provided instruction in computer literacy and English as a second language (ESL) to two schools' third- and eighth-grade language minority students not entitled to bilingual education. The program also provided in-service training to ESL teachers in the two schools. The Intensive Second Language Development for CAR Schools provided monthly citywide workshops for ESL coordinators, special education coordinators, and curriculum and instructional personnel at CAR schools and, when requested, for classroom teachers. The Curriculum Specialists Project recruited teams of bilingual teachers with curriculum development experience to work part-time to develop Chinese, Spanish, and French/Creole native language arts curricula for grades three to eight. The extent to which each program met its stated objectives and the recommendations for program improvement are outlined. (Author/MSE)

O.E.A. Evaluation Section Report

Robert Tobias, Administrator of Evaluation
Judith S. Torres, Senior Manager

STATE INCENTIVE GRANTS, 1986-87:

Language Development Support Systems
Intensive Second Language Development for CAR Schools
Curriculum Specialists Project

Prepared by the O.E.A.
Bilingual Education
Evaluation Unit

Jose J. Villegas,
Unit Manager

Grace Ibanez Friedman,
Principal Investigator

Shelley M. Fischer,
Data Analyst

New York City Public Schools
Office of Educational Assessment
Richard Guttenberg, Director

It is the policy of the Board of Education not to discriminate on the basis of race, creed, national origin, age, handicapping condition, sexual orientation, or sex, in its educational programs, activities, and employment policies, as required by law. Any person who believes he or she has been discriminated against should contact: Carole Guerra, Local Equal Opportunity Coordinator, Office of Educational Assessment, 110 Livingston Street, Room 743, Brooklyn, New York 11201. Inquiries regarding compliance with appropriate laws may also be directed to: Mercedes A. Nesfield, Director, Office of Equal Opportunity, 110 Livingston Street, Room 601, Brooklyn, New York; or the Director, Office of Civil Rights, U.S. Department of Education, 26 Federal Plaza, Room 33-130, New York, New York 10278.

A SUMMARY OF THE REPORT

In 1986-87, the New York State Education Department's Bureau of Bilingual Education, through its Incentive Grant Program, provided funds to the New York City Board of Education's Office of Bilingual Education for three projects. The common goal of these projects was to improve the quality of instruction in schools the state's Comprehensive Assessment Report (CAR) had designated as needing special assistance to raise low student performance levels. Each project had its own budget and staff, and was administered by a project director responsible to a Deputy Director of the Office of Bilingual Education.

Language Development Support Systems (L.D.S.S.) provided instruction in computer literacy and E.S.L. to third- to eighth-grade high-unentitled* language-minority students at one Bronx and one Manhattan public school, and in-service training to teachers who were or soon would be serving pupils in these two schools. L.D.S.S.'s on-site staff consisted of two master teachers and one paraprofessional. The project director and project secretary were stationed at the central office. In addition, several experts in the fields of E.S.L. and the use of the computer in language teaching volunteered or were hired on a consultancy basis to provide in-service training.

The project proposed two objectives for evaluation purposes: that 75 percent of the participating students would meet promotional criteria as measured by the Degrees of Reading Power test and the Language Assessment Battery; and that 90 percent of the teachers and paraprofessionals working with the target population would attend in-service workshops and be highly satisfied. The first objective could only be partially evaluated because formal promotional criteria apply only to fourth and seventh grades. Since L.D.S.S. served students in grades three through six, this objective could only be evaluated for fourth graders. Although these students improved from pretest to posttest, the proportion of students meeting the promotional criteria did not reach 75 percent. Additional analyses on D.R.P. scores indicate that students in grades three through five made statistically significant gains. Sixth graders made statistically significant losses. The second objective was achieved: the attendance rate at project-sponsored workshops exceeded the 90 percent criterion, and the results of staff evaluation forms to determine the workshops' effectiveness indicate a high degree of satisfaction.

---

*Students whose native language is not English and whose scores on the Language Assessment Battery (LAB) range from the twenty-first to the fortieth percentile. Although such students are not entitled to bilingual services under the terms of the Aspira consent decree and the Lau vs. Nichols Supreme Court decision, they are less proficient in English than their monolingual English-speaking peers.

Intensive Second Language Development for CAR Schools provided monthly citywide workshops for E.S.L. coordinators, special education coordinators, and curriculum/instructional personnel at CAR schools, and, on an as-requested basis, workshops for classroom teachers. Workshops were held at school-district headquarters and at individual schools. The staff for this project consisted of two full-time teacher trainers, in addition to the project director. All three were based at the central project office but spent a great deal of time in the field.

The project offered three objectives for evaluation purposes: that participating teachers would demonstrate an awareness and knowledge of effective E.S.L. practices and methodologies as measured by formal observations and a five-point training scale; that staff would demonstrate the ability to develop language learning activities to enhance students' English proficiency as measured by observations and a five-point training scale; and that 80 percent of the target teachers would attend staff development workshops and as a result more effectively carry out their job-related responsibilities. Since the proposed instruments (five-point training scale inventories) were not distributed to all teachers, the first two objectives could not be assessed as stated. However, based on the ones that were returned, staff were highly satisfied with the workshops. The third objective was partially achieved: Over 80 percent of the target teachers attended staff development workshops, but the results of staff evaluation forms to determine the workshops' influence on teacher effectiveness were not provided.

The **Curriculum Specialists Project** recruited teams of bilingual teachers with curriculum development experience to work on a part-time basis to develop Chinese, French/Creole, and Spanish native language arts curricula for grades three to eight.

The project's two evaluation objectives were achieved: three curriculum guides for use with Chinese-, Haitian Creole-, or Spanish-speaking students at third- to eighth-grade levels were developed; and these guides were distributed to teachers and coordinators at a citywide workshop.

The following recommendations apply to all three projects:

-- Greater efforts should be made to ensure continuity of project staffs, particularly the project directors.

-- Evaluation objectives should be conceptualized more clearly and formulated more succinctly.

-- Data needed to evaluate project objectives should be collected as proposed.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The production of this report, as of all Office of Educational Assessment Bilingual Education Evaluation Unit reports, is the result of a cooperative effort of regular staff and consultants. In addition to those whose names appear on the cover, Arthur Lopatin has edited the manuscripts. Margaret Scorza has reviewed and corrected reports, and has coordinated the editing and production process. Martin Kohli has spent many hours, creating, correcting, and maintaining data files. Maria Grazia Asselle, Rosalyn Alvarez, Donna Plotkin, and Milton Vickerman have interpreted student achievement and integrated their findings into reports. Finally, Betty Morales has worked intensively to produce, duplicate, and disseminate the completed documents. Without their able and faithful participation, the unit could not have handled such a large volume of work and still have produced quality evaluation reports.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		PAGE
I.	OVERVIEW	1
II.	FINDINGS	3
	Language Development Support Systems	3
	Intensive Second Language Development for CAR Schools	21
	Curriculum Specialists Project	28

LIST OF TABLES

	PAGE
Table 1: Distribution of L.D.S.S. Students by School and Grade.	9
Table 2: Number and Percent of L.D.S.S. Students by Country of Birth.	10
Table 3: English Reading Achievement.	17

STATE INCENTIVE GRANTS, 1986-87: LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT SUPPORT SYSTEMS, INTENSIVE SECOND LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT FOR CAR SCHOOLS, and CURRICULUM SPECIALISTS PROJECT

I. OVERVIEW

The three projects evaluated in this report developed, in large measure, in response to the findings of the New York State Education Department's Comprehensive Assessment Report (CAR), which identified a large number of New York City public schools with large populations of limited English proficient (LEP) students as being "in need of assistance" to raise the low achievement levels of their students. Each project was funded and staffed separately, and was headed by a project director who reported to a Deputy Director of the Office of Bilingual Education.

The Language Development Support Systems project was staffed by two master teachers and a paraprofessional. They used a combination of project-supplied Apple computers, school hardware, software, and a variety of other curricular materials to develop the English and native language skills of high-unentitled* language minority pupils at two CAR schools. In addition, in fourteen workshops offered over a seven-week period at each school, members of the project staff and outside experts in E.S.L. instruction and the use of the computer in language teaching provided in-service training to teachers who currently

*Students whose native language is not English and whose scores on the Language Assessment Battery (LAB) range from the twenty-first to the fortieth percentile. Although such students are not entitled to bilingual services under the terms of the Aspira Consent decree and the Lau vs. Nichols Supreme Court decision, they are less proficient in English than their monolingual English-speaking peers.

were or soon would be serving target students.

The Intensive Second Language Development for CAR Schools project performed two separate, but related, tasks:

It provided training workshops on E.S.L. teaching techniques to E.S.L. coordinators, special education coordinators, and, whenever space was available, to classroom teachers at CAR schools throughout the city. These workshops were held at several New York City colleges and universities. The presenters at these workshops were widely acknowledged experts in the field of E.S.L. Twenty-one workshops had been planned, but only seven were held.

It also provided workshops to classroom teachers on E.S.L. teaching methods largely in response to requests received at the coordinators' training workshops. The workshops were held at individual CAR schools and at district headquarters throughout the city. For the most part, these workshops were led by two teacher trainers employed by the project on a full-time basis.

The Curriculum Specialists Project employed, on an hourly basis, three teams of bilingual teachers with backgrounds in curriculum development to prepare Chinese, French/Creole, and Spanish native language arts curricula for grades two through eight.

II. FINDINGS

LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT SUPPORT SYSTEMS

Central Location:	131 Livingston Street Brooklyn, New York 11201
Participating Sites:	P.S. 26 (District 10) 1930 Andrews Avenue Bronx, New York 10453 P.S. 132 (District 6) 185 Wadsworth Avenue New York, New York 10033
Year of Operation:	1986-87, First year
Target Populations:	(1) 189 LEP students in grades 3-6 who scored between the 21st and 40th percentile on the LAB and/or fell 1-1.5 years behind grade level on standardized tests. (2) teachers of these students.
Program Director:	Ana Amaez

Overview

The start-up of the Language Development Support Systems (L.D.S.S.) project was delayed from September 1986 to March 1987 at P.S. 26, and to April 1987 at P.S. 132. This was largely due to the original project director's leaving in mid-1986 to work in a district and the difficulty in locating master teachers qualified to provide instruction in both E.S.L. and computer use. Of the two participating schools, only P.S. 132 had been named in the original project proposal. The last-minute decision of the three other proposed schools -- P.S. 85, P.S. 192, and P.S. 159 -- not to participate in L.D.S.S. meant that time was available to recruit only one school (P.S. 26) to replace the three that had

opted out of the project. An additional factor in the decision to cut back the number of sites was the growing awareness that L.D.S.S. did not have enough computer hardware to deliver the proposed services at four sites. In connection with the site cutback, the project director argued successfully for a budgetary modification to permit money saved by reducing the number of sites to be used to purchase additional equipment and supplies for the remaining sites and for the central office.

It was in large measure because of the new project director's ability to quickly analyze and solve the above-mentioned problems that L.D.S.S. was able to start during the spring.

The Sites

Since both P.S. 26 and P.S. 132 were extremely overcrowded, L.D.S.S. was housed in less than ideal circumstances at both sites. P.S. 26 is located in District 10, in the Bronx. It was built to serve 1,200 students but served 1,920 students during the year under review. The school's enrollment was predominantly black and Hispanic, and a high percentage came from families with low socioenconomic profiles and a high level of welfare dependency. Many students were from single-parent, female-headed households. The neighborhood surrounding the school had been deteriorating steadily until recent years, when, due to the efforts of more advantaged members of the community, it began undergoing a modest renaissance.

With over 700 more students than it had been designed to

STATE INCENTIVE GRANTS, 1986-87:

Language Development Support Systems
Intensive Second Language Development
for CAR Schools
Curriculum Specialists Project

OEA Evaluation Report

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. Tobias

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

serve, P.S. 26 was so overcrowded that the library had to be used to provide classroom space, and the school 'library' perforce became a small book cart that travelled from room to room. L.D.S.S.'s 'home' at P.S. 26 was a small, closet-like room next to the stage in the school auditorium. Because it was far too small, noisy, and ill-ventilated to serve as a classroom, the L.D.S.S. master teacher ended up sharing the computer lab with the school's regular computer teacher. She stored her curricular materials in a small hall closet near the computer lab, and she used the assistant principal's office to prepare her lessons and make telephone calls. Fortunately for L.D.S.S., the computer lab was one of the few underutilized rooms in the school. This made it possible for L.D.S.S. to install its Apples and conduct classes there for several periods per day. However, it must be noted that there was a gap of several weeks between the L.D.S.S. resource specialist's arrival at the school in March and the resolution of space for instructional use. This left project students with very little time to begin using the computers before the school year ended.

P.S. 132, located in District 6, in Manhattan, served a student body that was over 85 percent Hispanic, predominantly from the Dominican Republic. Like its counterpart in the Bronx, P.S. 132 was severely overcrowded. Nevertheless, the school administration and staff were generally enthusiastic supporters of educational innovation, especially in the areas of science and technology, and many innovative programs were in place or about

to be launched. Like the neighborhood surrounding P.S. 26, the environs of P.S. 132 were being upgraded after several years of decline.

The master teacher at P.S. 132 also shared classroom space with the regular computer teacher. She stored her curricular materials in a room on another floor which did double duty as school library and physical education classroom.

At both sites, inefficiencies resulting from the lack of space were compounded by the physical dispersion of target-group students. At P.S. 26, they were distributed in mainstream classes throughout the school. This meant that the master teacher and paraprofessional had to spend a good deal of time collecting students from their regular classrooms, conducting them to the room where the L.D.S.S. class was held, and then taking them back to their regular classrooms. At P.S. 132, target-group students were grouped in several homogenous classes distributed between the main school building and an annex. Consequently, the L.D.S.S. teacher at this site spent a good deal of time shuttling between classrooms located on several floors of two separate buildings. Thus, L.D.S.S. staff members at both sites spent a good deal of time travelling from room to room. The project director was so frustrated by the amount of time lost in this fashion that she was contemplating relocating the project to schools with better special arrangements.

Incompatibility between project-purchased software, which required 128K memory, and school-owned computers, which had 64K

memory, was an additional problem facing L.D.S.S. at P.S. 132. Although the master teacher at this site did not require the use of computers in her work with students, the staff-development component was severely hampered until equipment to upgrade the computers' memory could be ordered and installed.

Instructional Program for LEP Students

The educational services provided by L.D.S.S. varied at each site, in large part due to each school's instructional program and the background and interest of the resource specialists. At P.S. 26, L.D.S.S.'s instructional program consisted of elementary computer literacy, computer-assisted instruction, E.S.L., and the use of music and poetry to teach English. The resource teacher at P.S. 132 emphasized writing and taught in tandem with the classroom teachers. Her method was to ask the students to write short essays on topics of their choice, meet with them on a one-to-one basis to discuss the essays, have them read their essays to the entire class, and guide critical discussions of each essay. On the basis of the feedback emerging from these critical discussions, students were then asked to rewrite their essays.

Characteristics of Program Students

In 1986-87, L.D.S.S. served 189 students in grades three through six. Eighty-eight students were from P.S. 132 and 101 students were from P.S. 26. (See Table 1.) Thirty percent of the students were third graders; 23 percent were fourth graders; 40 percent were fifth graders; and 7 percent were sixth graders.

Seventy-one percent of the students were born in the United States and were raised in Spanish-speaking households; 13 percent of the students were born in the Dominican Republic. The remaining students came from other Central and South American countries. (See Table 2.)

TABLE 1

Distribution of L.D.S.S. Students by Grade and School

Grade	P.S. 26	P.S. 132	Total	Percent
3	26	30	56	30
4	25	19	44	23
5	36	39	75	40
6	14	0	14	7
TOTAL	101	88	189	
PERCENT OF TOTAL	53	47	100	

- Almost half of the students were fifth graders.
- Most students at P.S. 26 were in third, fourth, and fifth grades, whereas most students at P.S. 132 were in third or fifth grades.
- There were relatively few students in the sixth grade at P.S. 26; none of the students at P.S. 132 were sixth graders.

TABLE 2

Number and Percent of L.D.S.S. Students by Country of Birth

Country of Birth	Number	Percent
Dominican Republic	24	13
Puerto Rico	12	6
Cuba	4	2
El Salvador	3	2
Haiti	1	*
Panama	1	*
Ecuador	1	*
Argentina	1	*
Philippines	1	*
China	1	*
United States	134	71
TOTAL	183**	100

* Less than one percent.
**Data were missing for six students.

- Almost three-fourths of the students were born in the United States.

Staffing

Full-time project staff consisted of three professionals, one paraprofessional, and a secretary. All seemed very hard working, highly motivated, and committed to the project's goals.

The project director had over ten years of classroom teaching experience. Because she lacked computer expertise, she familiarized herself with the field by reading and consulting with experts on the educational applications of the computer. As a result of these efforts, she had amassed impressive collections of computer software and curricular materials.

One L.D.S.S. master teacher had many years of teaching experience in both Puerto Rico and the mainland. Her specialities included music and sports. The second master teacher had been educated and trained in the United States. She had majored in languages and taught in a variety of programs including special education and the education of the gifted before assuming her current position. She was enrolled in a certificate program on the educational applications of the computer at the Bank Street College of Education. Both master teachers were assigned to the central office for one day per week. They used this time to develop and refine curricula and to discuss problems and plan future activities with the project director.

The paraprofessional wanted to become a teacher and was studying education at a local community college. She appeared

dedicated to teaching and receptive to supervision.

The project secretary was highly experienced, and was familiar with grant administration and Board of Education procedure and structure.

In addition to full-time staff, L.D.S.S. employed, on a consultancy basis, well-known experts to make presentations in the educational applications of the computer, in E.S.L., and in language development at the bi-weekly staff-development sessions.

Staff Development

At each site, L.D.S.S. offered seven weeks of semi-weekly after-school in-service training for teachers who were or would soon be teaching program students. The 23 teachers participating in the workshops were remunerated on a per-session basis. The workshops were held either at the school or at the district headquarters for each school.

The goals of these sessions were to:

-- familiarize participants with L.D.S.S., particularly with the role of resource specialists;

-- develop participants' knowledge of the full range of E.S.L. teaching techniques; and

-- train participants in the educational uses of the computer.

The presenters were outside experts who volunteered or who were hired on a per-session basis, the L.D.S.S. master teachers, and the schools' own computer teachers. The workshops consisted of both lecture/discussions and hands-on sessions at each school's computer lab. Topics included:

-- an introduction to computer use;

-- E.S.L. methods and techniques;

-- teaching thinking skills to LEP students;

-- teaching writing skills to LEP students;

-- how to use computers in the classroom;

-- how to use E.S.L. Harmony language software; and

-- how to evaluate software.

The workshop series resulted in the production and distribution of two editions of a booklet, Language Development Support Systems: Integrating Computers Into the Curriculum: a summary manual designed to showcase teachers' efforts, and a full-length manual to provide detailed information to E.S.L. coordinators, resource teachers, and classroom teachers.

Findings

Following are the two objectives for L.D.S.S. contained in the project proposal and the evaluation findings for each:

> --By the conclusion of the project period from July 1, 1986 to June 30, 1987, 75 percent of the participating students will meet promotional criteria as a result of participating in the program as measured by the citywide standardized reading test entitled Degrees of Reading Power* and LAB score.

Formal promotional criteria are applicable to students in fourth and seventh grades; for these students to be promoted they must score at or above the thirty-second percentile on the D.R.P. Since data are available for students in grades three through six, this objective can only be evaluated for the fourth graders. Pretest data are available for 40 students of whom 11 (28 percent) scored at or above the thirty-second percentile. Of the 43 students for whom posttest data were available, 23 (53 percent) met the promotional criteria.

Although students did improve from pretest to posttest, the proposed objective was not achieved.

However, additional analyses were computed to assess students' achievement in English reading. A correlated t-test was computed on the D.R.P. to determine whether the difference

*The Degrees of Reading Power (D.R.P.) was developed by the College Board to provide information about student reading ability on the same scale used to describe the difficulty of textbooks. The Kuder-Richardson reliability estimates are above .94, and various studies have demonstrated the validity of the test. It has convergent validity correlation coefficients with the California Achievement Test (CAT) ranging from .77 to .85, and it was found to have a predictive validity correlation coefficient of .89 with the Word Completion Test.

between mean pretest and posttest scores was significantly greater than would be expected from chance variation alone.

Raw scores were converted to Normal Curve Equivalent (N.C.E.) scores, which are normalized standard scores. They have the advantage of forming an equal interval scale so that scores and gains can be averaged. For the norming population, N.C.E.s have a mean of 50, a standard deviation of approximately 20, and a range from 1 to 99. Thus, scores can be compared to the norming population.

Given that N.C.E.s are based on the norm group's scores, a raw gain, which usually results in grade equivalent gains, can result in no change or a decline in N.C.E.s. There are several reasons for this. Several consecutive raw scores may correspond to the same N.C.E., especially at the upper and lower ends of the scale. In addition, the norm group is also making raw score (and grade equivalent) gains, so that students must gain as much as the norm group to stay at the same N.C.E. Therefore, an N.C.E. gain, no matter how small, indicates improvement while a decline in N.C.E.s does not necessarily mean that a student is not making progress.

Any gain in N.C.E.s always indicates improvement relative to the norm group and a gain of seven or more N.C.E.s is considered exemplary in Chapter I programs.

As Table 3 indicates, mean N.C.E. gains for students in grades three through five who were both pretested and posttested on the D.R.P. were statistically significant. Students in grades

three, four, and five made mean N.C.E. gains of 5.6, 4.9, and 7.2 N.C.E.s respectively. However, mean N.C.E. scores for students in grade six declined by 5.8. Although this decrease was statistically significant, caution should be exercised in interpreting grade six data, as only ten students' scores were available for analysis.

The proportion of students making gains was also computed. (See Table 3.) The largest group to make gains was the fifth grade (72 percent or 41). The majority of fourth graders (64 percent or 25) and third graders (63 percent or 19) also made gains. Only one sixth grader (10 percent) made a gain.

These analyses suggest that, overall, these students are improving in reading achievement as measured by the D.R.P. Although fewer than 75 percent of the fourth graders met the promotional criteria indicating that the objective was not achieved, other analyses of the D.R.P. test indicate that students are improving.

TABLE 3

English Reading Achievement

Significance of Mean N.C.E. Score Differences
Between Initial and Final Test Scores of L.D.S.S. Students
on the Degrees of Reading Power Test by Grade

		Pretest		Posttest				
Grade	N	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean Difference	Mean S.D.	Proportion Of Students Making Gains
3	30	31.6	14.4	37.2	11.6	5.6*	13.9	63
4	39	35.5	10.0	40.4	12.5	4.9*	12.3	64
5	57	42.8	9.0	50.1	9.6	7.2*	10.4	72
6	10	50.3	9.8	44.5	7.3	-5.8*	7.4	10

*Statistically significant at the .05 level.

- Third, fourth, and fifth graders made statistically significant gains.
- Losses made by sixth graders were statistically significant.

--By the conclusion of the project, from September 1, 1986 to June 30, 1987, the teachers and paraprofessionals working with the target student population will more effectively carry out job-related responsibilities as a result of in-service workshops conducted with a 90 percent attendance rate as measured by the ratio of attendance to registrants and staff evaluation forms.

According to the project director, the attendance rate over the seven-week workshop period was 98 percent.

The form used to evaluate the workshops asked participants to rate the clarity, organization, knowledge, scope and usefulness of the presentations, and to provide an overall assessment of the sessions on a four-point Likert scale (1 = poor; 4 = excellent). The four-point scale was used to prevent participants from using the non-committed midpoint response on a five-point scale. Despite the more restricted range, the mean overall rating for the workshops was 3.9, indicating that participants were extremely pleased with the program; further, the degree of agreement among participants and the overall consistency of high satisfaction ratings (s.d.=.34) also supports the finding that teachers were highly satisfied with the program. Even when each item on the evaluation form is assessed individually, the same pattern emerges. All items were consistently rated an average of 3.8 or higher (s.d.s ranged from .18 to .39).

Teachers were also asked if they would recommend these workshops to other colleagues if they were conducted at a future date. Of the 157 teachers who responded to this item, 156 (99 percent) indicated "Yes" and only 1 (1 percent) indicated

"Unsure."

Taken together, the results of the attendance data and satisfaction ratings indicate that this objective was achieved and surpassed.

Conclusions and Recommendations

In its first year of operation, L.D.S.S. confronted three major problems: the departure of the original project director, difficulty in recruiting suitably qualified master teachers, and the last-minute decision of three of the four proposed sites not to participate in the project. These problems forced the postponement of L.D.S.S.'s beginning from the fall to the spring semester and a reduction in the number of sites from four to two.

Monies saved by reducing the number of sites were applied to the purchase of additional computers, software, and curricular materials. Two computers were assigned to the project's central office, where the two master teachers worked one day per week.

Both of the sites chosen for the project were severely overcrowded, forcing L.D.S.S. staff members to store project materials in cramped, out-of-the-way locations and to share classrooms with regular staff members.

Finally, because at one site the target group of high-unentitled LEP students was dispersed in a number of mainstream classes and at another, was dispersed in homogeneous classes located in both the main school building and an annex, L.D.S.S. staff members at both sites had to spend a good deal of their time travelling from room to room.

The following recommendations are made to improve L.D.S.S.'s operation in the future:

-- If L.D.S.S. is to operate successfully at P.S. 26 and P.S. 132, adequate storage and work space must be provided.

-- Scheduling of L.D.S.S. classes should take account of the fact that the dispersion of project students at both sites requires project personnel to spend a great deal of time moving from classroom to classroom. To minimize the time lost in this fashion, students might be scheduled for fewer but longer L.D.S.S. classes.

-- In order to more fully develop classroom teachers' language-teaching skills, the in-service workshops should be continued.

INTENSIVE SECOND LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT FOR CAR SCHOOLS

Location:	Office of Bilingual Education 131 Livingston Street Brooklyn, NY 11201
Year of Operation:	1986-87, First year
Target Population:	E.S.L. coordinators and teachers serving LEP students in CAR schools
Project Director:	Phyllis Ziegler

Overview

Of the three projects evaluated in this report, Intensive Second Language Development for CAR Schools was the only one to start in September, as scheduled. According to the project proposal, the primary aim of the Intensive Second Language Development for CAR Schools program was "to develop a cadre of professionals capable of implementing successful E.S.L. and language teaching strategies aimed at enhancing the English language proficiency of students identified as limited English proficient (LEP) and attending CAR schools."

The means for achieving this goal were to have been a series of 21 workshops on "successful E.S.L. methodology and practices." These workshops were to have provided "training on methods and materials related to E.S.L. and integration of E.S.L. into different curricula [sic] topics." Again according to the proposal, these workshops were to have been delivered by two teacher trainers working under the supervision of the project director.

Although the project retained these goals, in order to serve the widest range of educational professionals while making the most effective possible use of its limited full-time staff, it was implemented differently than proposed. Instead of a series of 21 workshops for teachers, the project had two distinct components: (1) a series of seven citywide monthly workshops for E.S.L. coordinators, special education coordinators, and special education personnel; and (2) a total of 53 workshops for classroom teachers.

The seven citywide workshops were held at a number of colleges and universities. Information about these workshops was distributed via circulars. Since large attendance was anticipated for each, R.S.V.P.s were required. Classroom teachers were allowed to attend workshops that had been undersubscribed by coordinators and special education personnel. Per-session attendance averaged approximately 100.

All the workshops were conducted by prominent authors, scholars, and practitioners in the areas of E.S.L. and language learning. Commercial publishing houses partially subsidized the workshops by providing funds for lunch and travel stipends for the presenters. Participants were provided with articles relevant to each workshop topic. The following topics were treated:

1. Big Books and Holistic Language (October 1986)
2. E.S.L. in the Content Areas, K-6 (November 1986)
3. The Natural Approach (December 1986)

4. E.S.L. Through the Arts (January 1987)

5. Direct Reading Instruction (February 1987)

6. Improving Thinking Skills: E.S.L. in Content Areas Grades 5-9 (March 1987)

7. Jazz Chants: E.S.L. Through Drama (May 1987)

The 53 workshops for teachers were held at CAR schools and district headquarters throughout the city, and, for the most part, were held in response to requests made by participants at the seven citywide workshops. The chief presenters at these workshops were the project's two full-time resource specialists. Prior to most of the workshops, the resource specialists visited the schools at which the workshops were to be presented in order to get a firsthand picture of teacher needs. They also made post-workshop visits to help teachers incorporate lessons learned at the workshops into their classroom work. Although the workshops stressed a practical, hands-on approach, a variety of important theoretical issues were also introduced.

Since these workshops were held in response to very specific requests, a variety of topics were covered. For example:

1. Learning Through Total Physical Response
2. Observing a Lesson
3. Getting the Main Idea: Working With LEP Students
4. Storytelling
5. Learning in a Multicultural World
6. Parent Workshop on E.S.L. and Home Learning
7. Big Books for Little Kids
8. Early Childhood Skills: Listening, Reading, Speaking,

and Writing

9. E.S.L. in the Regular Classroom
10. The LEP Child in Kindergarten

Staffing

The project director had master's degrees in Spanish and bilingual education. She had been employed by the Board of Education since 1975 and had experience as a classroom teacher, bilingual education/E.S.L. teacher, project coordinator, and teacher trainer.

One of the resource specialists had taught in District 17 for 11 years before transferring to the Office of Bilingual Education three years ago. She had a master's in E.S.L.

The other resource specialist had taught in District 17 for 10 years before transferring to the Office of Bilingual Education one year ago. He had experience in early childhood education and a master's degree in English.

Staff Development

In order to augment their own skills and inform administrators and specialists in other areas about the value of the E.S.L. approach, the project director and the two resource specialists participated in a variety of staff-development activities. For example, the project director attended a series of training sessions for language arts coordinators.

Findings

Following are the evaluation objectives for the Intensive Second Language Development for CAR Schools program and the evaluation findings for each:

-- By the conclusion of the project period from September 1, 1986 to June 30, 1987, the target teachers will demonstrate awareness and knowledge of successful E.S.L. practices and methodologies as a result of participating in the staff development training sessions, as measured by formal observations and a five-point training scale inventory, tabulating and ascertaining percentage of change.

Five-point training scale inventories were not distributed to all of the teachers at all of the workshops; therefore the objective could not be assessed as proposed. However, according to the project director and teacher trainers, the response to the workshops was almost uniformly positive. Comments written on the five-point training scale inventories that were returned include: "wonderful," "inspiring," "excellent new techniques learned," "enlightening," and "put me on your mailing list."

-- By the conclusion of the project period from September 1 1986 to June 30, 1987, participating staff will demonstrate the ability to develop language learning activities geared towards enhancing English proficiency as measured by formal observatons and a five-point training scale inventory, tabulating and ascertaining percentage of change.

The results of the five-point training scale inventories designed to ascertain change were not provided because the time and paperwork required to accomplish this task was beyond the scope of the training sessions; therefore, the objective could not be assessed as proposed. However, other qualitative

evaluation forms and reports by program staff, indicate a high degree of satisfaction with the workshops.

-- By the conclusion of the project from September 1, 1986 to June 30, 1987, the target teachers will more effectively carry out job-related responsibilities as a result of workshop attendance at an 80 percent rate as measured by the ratio of attendance to registrants and staff evaluation forms.

The project director indicated that R.S.V.P.s were required of workshop invitees because the training sessions were often times oversubscribed. According to her reports, attendance exceeded 80 percent at each workshop. However, the objective was only partially achieved because it was not possible to determine if target teachers were more effective in carrying out job-related responsibilities. But, based on responses to qualitative evaluation forms, teachers not only evaluated the workshops highly, they also believed they would be helpful when applied to future classroom activities.

Conclusions and Recommendations

By using a modified approach, Intensive Second Language Development for CAR Schools appeared to be going a long way toward realizing its goals. Using the resources available to it in the most effective manner possible, the project held two separate sets of workshops, one for coordinators (taught by consultants) and another for classroom teachers (taught by two full-time resource specialists).

At an interview with a member of the evaluation team, the project director expressed great satisfaction with the

project. However, she said additional clerical help would be welcomed to produce the large number of photocopies needed for every training session. She also said that, in view of the project's citywide scope and its dual audience of classroom teachers and program coordinators, additional resource specialists were badly needed.

To make the project function more effectively in the future the following recommendations are offered:

-- Negotiate with the funding source to hire one more full-time resource specialist.

-- Hire additional clerical help to help with the large volume of photocopying work required for virtually every workshop session.

-- Data needed to evaluate proposed objectives should be collected, or the objectives should be changed to reflect the revised scope of the program.

CURRICULUM SPECIALISTS PROJECT

Location:	131 Livingston Street Brooklyn, New York 11201
Year of Operation:	1986-87, First year
Target Population:	Third- through eighth-grade teachers serving Chinese, Haitian, and Spanish LEP students in CAR schools
Project Director:	Dr. Aurea E. Rodriguez

Overview

Although Chinese-, Haitian Creole-, and Spanish-speaking students currently are the three largest LEP populations attending the New York City public schools, third- to eighth-grade native language arts curricula are lacking for these groups. The Curriculum Specialists Project was designed to remedy this deficiency by hiring, for each language, teams of bilingual teachers with curriculum-writing experience to produce, on a part-time basis, the needed curricula. The curricula were then to have been reproduced and distributed to all New York City Public Schools, particularly the CAR schools.

A project advisory committee was formed to plan the work of each team. The committee met once, in December 1986, and, in view of budgetary and time constraints, it suggested a modified operational design for the project's first year: instead of developing comprehensive native language arts curricula, the teams would concentrate on developing materials in the target languages that focussed on vocabulary enrichment.

Three curriculum-writing teams composed of experienced bilingual teachers with curriculum-writing experience were hired on a per-session basis. Each four-person team met at the Office of Bilingual Education twice a week after school hours to work on the six-part framework that had been suggested by the advisory committee. The framework was as follows:

1. Rationale/philosophy
2. Concepts
3. Objectives
4. Skills
5. Suggested Activities
6. Vocabulary

After each session, the members of the curriculum-writing teams wrote up summary notes. The project director reviewed these notes once a month.

Interviewed by a member of the evaluation team, the project director said that she felt the project proposal to be too ambitious in its scope, did not permit sufficient time for the various curricula to be fully developed (she noted that such extensive curriculum development projects typically require three years), and did not provide a field-testing phase. She also said she was discontented with per-session staffing because it prevented the development of long-term continuity. Finally, she pointed out that the project was housed in very cramped quarters, making it very difficult for each team to meet and to store their work.

Findings

Following are the objectives proposed for the Curriculum Specialists Project and the evaluation findings for each one:

-- By the conclusion of the project period from September 1, 1986 to June 30, 1987, project staff will have developed new or adopted materials for use with students at third- to eighth-grade levels whose primary language is Chinese, Haitian Creole, or Spanish as a result of curriculum writing as measured by publication of a curriculum manuscript entitled Learning in a Multicultural World, Grades 3-8.

Although they were not completed until September 30, 1987, the three curricula were developed as proposed.

-- By the conclusion of the project period from September 1, 1986 to June 30, 1987, materials developed will be disseminated to interested individuals, school districts, parents, organizations, and other interested parties as a result of curriculum development and publication as measured by distribution of curriculum and inventory request log forms.

The program objective was met: the three curriculum guides were presented in experimental form to sixty teachers and coordinators at a citywide workshop.

Recommendations

Although the lack of native language arts curricula in the targeted languages necessitates a program such as this one, the following changes are required if the Curriculum Specialists Project is to met its potential:

1. The project should be extended for an additional one or two years.

2. Project-produced curricula should be field tested.

3. Discussion should take place with the funding source to explore adding three full-time curriculum specialists, one for each language, to replace the per-session staff.